

The Tryal and Examination of a late Libel, intituled, *A New Test of the Church of Englands Loyalty.*

With some Reflections upon the Additional Libel, intituled, *An Instance of the Church of Englands Loyalty.*

THe Church of England has of late years especially been on the Charitable side towards the Papists, and has allowed them to be Christians and not Anti-Christians; nay to be a true Church and not the Synagogue of Satan; and seemed to have utterly forgotten the two Fundamental points of Popery, *That Hereticks are to be Pursued with Fire and Sword*, which was Determined by the *Lateran Council*, under *Innocent the Third*, and conscientiously practised ever since; And *that Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks*, which the Council of *Constance* Determined in the Case of *John Huss*, and *Jerome of Prague*: And in this Excess of Charity which hopeth all things and believeth all things, they have Hoped against hope, and have exercised strong acts of Faith where no Faith is, neither have they had any apprehensions of being destroyed, but rather of being Saved and Protected with Fire and Sword; But finding in great measure their Charity Mistaken, to the end that all their Disappointments may seem Just upon them, they are presently taxed with *Disloyalty*. So *Aescops Lamb*, when she was to be Eaten, was charged by the Wolf for muddying the upper part of the Stream which was far above her. In Vindication therefore of the Church of England, and to shew her Innocency in this point, I shall examine this New Test of the Church of Englands Loyalty, where she is tryed and cast, weighed in the Balance and found light, but, to our comfort, it is by Deceitful Weights and Measures.

The first Device is to pretend, "That the Church of England appropriate to themselves alone the Principles of true Loyalty, and that no other Church or Communion on Earth can be consistent with Monarchy, or indeed with any Government. This is a presumption of so high a nature, that it renders the Church of England a despicable Enemy to the rest of Mankind.

To which I answer, That the Church of England is here represented by that which is the true Character of the Church of Rome, which has all along been a known Engrosser. Which pretends to have all Faith, and all Holiness, and will have all Heaven to herself, and pretending to have the Keys of it, will suffer none others to come thither. Whereas the Church of England allows, not only that all Protestants have true Faith and true

Loyalty as well as she, and the same Faith and Loyalty, as appears by the Harmony of their Confessions, but also that Pagans are capable of Moral Vertue, such as Loyalty is, and have heretofore been great Examples of it. Many of them have lookt upon themselves as not Born for themselves, but for their Country, and were strict Observers of the Laws: And it is well known, that *Socrates* in particular had that Reverence for the Laws, that though he was put upon it by his Friends, yet he would not break them to save his Life. *His Bones and Sinews, as his words are in Plato's Phædo, could easily have carried him into a Foreign Country, but he would not suffer them to do it.* And therefore this Author, in saying that the Church of England avers, "That no other Sect or Community on Earth from the Rising to the Setting Sun can be capable of this Singular Gift of Loyalty"; betrays his Malice and Ignorance together, and plainly shews, that though he make new Tests of Loyalty, yet he does not know what Loyalty is.

The word *Loyal* is a term of Law, and is indifferently applied to things as well as Persons. So a Loyal Judgment is a Judgment according to Law, and is opposed to a false Judgment. A Loyal Contract is a Lawful Bargain. A Man buys an Horse in a Market, and then he has a Loyal Title, a Legal Title to him. So again a Person behaves himself according to Law, and observes the Laws of the Land, and then he is a Loyal Man; he is *Legalis Homo*, as a Juryman is required to be; that is, such a one as cannot be challenged for a Criminal, nor a Breaker of the Laws. And in case a Man's Behaviour be according to Law, he is *Loyal*, whether it respect a Superior or an Inferiour. *Action n'est autre chose que Loyal demand de son droit.* An Action is nothing else but the Loyal Demand of a Mans Right. *Mirror*, p. 115, and p. 121. A Serjeant at Law shall not use any Deceits in his practice, nor consent to them, *mes Loyalties maintiendra le droit de son Client*, &c. But shall Loyally maintain the Right of his Client, so that it be not overthrown by any Folly, Negligence, or Default of his.

From hence it follows, that Loyalty can have no other Rule or Measure but the Law; for though some Men love to have confused notions of things, and speak of Loyalty as if it were a thing in the Clouds, and some abstruse matter over our Heads, yet it appears to be a plain thing, and of easie comprehension, for it is nothing else but Conformity to the Laws. The plain English of Loyalty is Lawfulness, and it is utterly Impossible that there should be any other Test or Touchstone, any other Measure or Standard of Lawfulness but the Law itself. For if there had been no Law, as there had been no Transgression nor Violation of it, so there had been no Loyalty nor Conformity to it. And therefore Loyalty against Law is a Contradiction; it is Obedience made up of Disobedience. The Law is that which makes the King our Liege Lord, and us his Liege People, and accordingly both Prince and People are mutually Sworn to the keeping of it; and our Allegiance binds us to an Obedience according to Law, and not otherwise. To obey the King himself contrary to Law is Disloyalty, and to disobey the King in Obedience to the Laws is Loyalty. If it be not thus, Then all the Judges of England for these 340 Years and upwards, have been all Sworn to be Disloyal. For they are sworn to proceed according to Law, though the King by his Letters or Writs under the great Seal, or under the little Seal, or by his own mouth should command them the contrary.

2. 18. 20. Ed. 3. Fortesc. c. 5. 1. *Etiam Rex per Literas suas aut Oraculum Contrarium iussit*

will keep them: for so long the Law enables them to hold their own, they can challenge the Benefit of the Law; they can claim a Legal Protection, which is far better than any which is Illegal and Arbitrary, Uncertain and Precarious, and they are on the better side of the Hedge of all the Violators of the Law whatsoever. I shall not need therefore to trouble my self with the Remainder of this new Test, any otherwise than by making some very short Notes upon the most remarkable passages in it.

I. The first charge is, *That the Church of England Assisted Usurpers to Invade the Crown,* meaning the Lady *Jane* and *Q. Elizabeth*.

As for the first of these, I cannot see how it can be charged upon the Church of England, because the Protestants were divided about *Q. James* Title, some were for it, and some were against it, as particularly Judge *Hales* and the *Suffolk* Gospellers, who stuck to *Q. Mary*, and were but sordidly rewarded for it. But to wave *Q. James* Case, and what might be said concerning it from the Statute 11 Hen. 7. c. 1. I think this is a very fair offer, That when the *Papists* have answered for all the bad Titles which were set up in the times of *Popery*, which were at least in the proportion of two bad ones for one good, we will then answer, as well as we can, for that single one, which has happened since the time of the Reformation.

The other Usurper, which the Church of England Assisted to Invade the Crown, was *Q. Elizabeth*, a known *Bastard*. It is well known that a Popish Parliament then sitting, acknowledged her Title, and Assisted in setting her upon the Throne; and not the Church of England, which was then driven into Corners, and into Foreign Countries; and was not in a Condition to Assist any body. And whereas *Q. Elizabeth* is said to have been a known *Bastard*, the Church and Court of *Rome* knew the Contrary. For they knew that her Mothers Marriage was good, because the former Marriage was naught, And the former was Confessedly naught, because it wanted the Pope's Dispensation and Licence, which was bought with a mighty sum of Money, to make it good. If it had been Lawful in it self, it had not needed the Pope's Dispensation to make it Lawful. And we are willing to refer it to all the World, whether the Pope's Dispensation can make an Unlawful Marriage to be Lawful.

II. We are told, *That the Prelatick Protestancy, called the Church of England, enacted those Bloody Cannibal Laws, to Hang, Draw, and Quarter, the Priests of the Living God.* I suppose he means the Mass Priests. Now these Canibal Laws were made to Hang them, not as Priests, but as Traytors and Traytor-makers. But I would fain ask, Might not any Sheep-stealer, or Cut-purse, in *Newgate*, exclaim against Persecution, and the Bloody Canibal Laws, with a much better grace? That a Man made in the Image of God should be Hanged like a Dog, for such trifles as a Sheep, or a little loose Pocket-money! Whereas the Law of God only required *Fourfold Restitution* in those cases; and in some Countryes, Stealing was not only Lawful but was encouraged as an Accomplishment. But on the other hand, In Gods own Government Idolatrous Priests were to be put to Death. And by the Law of Nations in all Countryes whatsoever, Spies, Deserters, Adherents and Emissaries of a Publick Enemy (as by our Law the Pope is to us, and by his Law all Hereticks are Declared to be to him) are all to be Hanged up.

And then as for the Mass Priests being called *the Priests of the Living God*, I appeal to the

the Senses and Understanding of all Mankind, Whether the Lord God, the Maker, the Former, and the Creator of a Mass Priest, whom he carries in his Box and Wychion be a Living God or no? Nay, according to the School of the Eucharist, I will be judged by the very Rats and Mice which often run away with him.

III. The next thing the Church, or rather the State of England is charged with, for it was a Parliament business at least Thirteen Years, is the Execution of *Mary Q. of Scots*, for Treason against *Q. Elizabeth*: Wherein if they did any thing contrary to Law, and the Allegiance due to their then present *Q. Elizabeth*, they are chargeable with Disloyalty, otherwise not. And whereas this Author calls it a *Barbarous Murder*, and an *Execrable Fact*, I would desire him to speak low, for if the Laws should over-hear him, they would call this, Arraigning the Justice of the Nation. And in saying that this Fact was *the First of the kind*, he betrays great Ignorance: He might as well have said, That the Emperour *Licinius*, Colleague with *Constantine the Great*, and Queen *Joan of Naples*, are still Living. And as yet I have never read, that what *Constantine* did in that case, was to the Scandal and Reproach of Christianity, or even of those Christians who lived under *Licinius*, and joyned with *Constantine* the Great in that Affair.

But fourthly I find (which is the Substance of the sixth and seventh Pages) That the Church of England might have all her old scores cleared, and all her former faults forgotten, and might pass for Loyal still, if she would now consent to the Repeal of the *Sanguinary Penal Laws*, (which were purposely Enacted to maintain the Usurpation of Queen Elizabeth), and the late *Impious Tests*. Which puts me in mind of the conditions of Peace, which the Wolves sent to the Sheep. The main Article was, That the Sheep should deliver up their Dogs, which they kept for a Guard, and which were the great hindrance to a firm and lasting Peace. But every body Knows how long the Peace lasted. But to proceed, If the *Sanguinary Penal Laws* were purposely Enacted to maintain the Usurpation of Queen Elizabeth, How came they to be Enacted afresh in the first year of King James, when that Usurpation was over? How came they two years after 330 Jac. 1. to be called Religious and Necessary Laws? And How came more of these Religious and Necessary Laws to be made in the same Parliament, and in succeeding Parliaments? As for the late *Impious Tests* (choice Epithets for the Laws of the Land) they were made as appears by the Title of the Acts, To prevent Dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants. Now the Sheep might safely have parted with their Dogs, if the Peaceable Wolves at the same time would have parted with their Fangs.

5. In the last page he says, As for the Tests themselves, it is not my Province to shew the Absurdities of them in point of Doctrine. It is well it is not, for he must get Abundance of Help whenever he goes about that Work. However he offers at it in these words. "Though by the by I must hold it a great folly, to say that Transubstantiation is not a Probable Opinion at the least, considering the Number and Learning of those who maintain it, which is the best part of Christendom: And if it be a Probable Opinion, it must be a great Temerity in any man to Swear there is no such thing. I had always thought that a Probable Opinion must be made out by Proofs and Probable Reasons, and not by Numbers and telling of Noses. But it seems the Cause of Transubstantiation runs very low, when it must be maintained by such Arguments, as hold much Stronger for Paganism and for Diana of the Ephesians, whom all the World worshipped.

The Religion of the *Heathens* was of a larger extent and of longer standing than Popery; and yet we dare not say, that it was a False Religion. I think we do not renounce Transubstantiation upon Oath, but only by publick Declaration and Subscription; But if we did, it would by no means be a rash Oath. For may not I safely Swear, That there is no such Figure as a Square Circle, when the thing involves manifold contradictions, and it is plainly Demonstrable that the Properties of a Square and of a Circle are utterly Inconsistent. Now we have a Thousandfold more Evidence, and are able to make as clear Proof and Demonstration of it a Thousand times over, That there never was, nor is, nor can be any such thing as Transubstantiation, which is nothing else but a Heap of Contradictions, Absurdities, and Impossible Falshoods. And therefore we have the same Assurance that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation never came, nor could come, from God, as we have of this clear and evident Truth, *That it is Impossible for God to Lye.*

6. And now we are come to the Conclusion and upshot of the business, which is in these words. "So that upon the whole matter the Loyal Church of *England* must either change her old Principles of Loyalty, and take Example by her Catholick Neighbours how to behave her self towards a Prince who is not of her Persuasion; or she must give his Majesty leave not to nourish a Snake in his own Bosome, but rather to withdraw his Royal Protection, which was promised upon the Account of her constant Fidelity. I wish this Author had bin more expresse and particular in this Dilemma and difficulty, to which he thinks he has reduced the Church of *England*; Either to turn over a new leaf, and learn a new lesson of Loyalty from her Catholick Neighbours, or else to do worse. For he does not tell us, Which of our Catholick Neighbours we must take Example by, Whether Mrs. *Celier*, and Mr. *Selater*, who have both Published to the world, That they turned Papists, that is have made themselves High-Traitors, for the Improvement of their Loyalty; Or whether we should take Example by this Author himself, to call Queen Elizabeth *Bastard*, to Ridicule an *Infalible English Parliament*; as he calls it in Scorn, to Deprave and vilifie several Statutes, which are and will be the Standing Laws of the Land, till such time as they are Repealed by Act of Parliament: And therefore he has not been so clear as he might have been in this point. Which the Church of *England* will hardly trouble herself about, because she likes her old Principles of Loyalty very well; and is not given to Change, but knows when she is well. In the mean time this Author tells us very plainly, and expressly enough, That till the Church of *England* Change their Old Principles of Loyalty and take Example by their Catholick Neighbours, they are to be lookt upon as a Snake in his Majestie's Bosome, and cannot expect to be Protected. Alas! this Gentleman is utterly mistaken. For a Legal Establishment has a Right to a Legal Protection, and the King is bound both by his Oath, and by the duty of his Kingly Office to Protect the Church of *England* as it is by Law established. And therefore to talk of withdrawing Protection from the Church of *England*, is to talk of removing the *Thames* to *Turk*. But we are so much used to such empty threatnings and flashes in the pan, that we know they will not kill. So the Reply to the *Oxford* Reasons against Addressing threatens the Church of *England*, that by the Prerogative in Matters Ecclesiastical it may be in great measure Legally Subverted. p. 4. A Legal Establishment even while it remains such, Legally Subverted. They would make us believe;

believe, that the Laws of *England* were made up of *political Equivocations*, and did blow Hot and Cold with the same mouth. But besides, That *Replyer* should be told that a thousand more of his pompous Quotations which were written in the time of the High Commission will not Revive that Branch of the Statute *1 Eliz.* upon which the High Commission Court was erected. And likewise he should be told, that a Power given by One Statute, and taken away afterwards by Two, is certainly reduced to its Primitive nothingness.

But I return to our present Author only to take my leave of him, which he has done of the Church of *England* in these words. "And now let us leave the Holy Mother Church at liberty to consult what new Measures of Loyalty she ought to take for her own dear Interest, and for ought I know it may be worth her serious consideration. I am in hopes, That this Church of God, *which he hath purchased with his own Blood*, (though this Author be pleased to trample upon her with so much Scorn and Insolence) will take Occasion, even at an Enemies bidding, to consult what New Measures of Loyalty she ought to take for her own dear Interest, and for the Interest of Posterity which is much dearer, and for the Everlasting Interest of both, which is dearest of all. And will humbly and heartily Bewaile her Disloyalty to her great Lord and Master, and those many, and great, and open Transgressions and Violations of His most Holy and Righteous Laws which are amongst us. And O that every member of that Communion in particular would speedily repent, and return to his Duty, and persevere in a course of Holy Obedience to his lives end! This is the Loyalty that is too much wanting in the Church of *England*, which is due to the Laws of our Blessed Saviour, who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords. As for her Earthly Lords, They cannot charge her with any Disobedient or Lawless carriage towards them, or with any Disregard to the Laws, unless perhaps in some unwarrantable Official Instances, which it would hardly be Proper for them to Object against her. And to the end that both we and our Children after us may be Better Subjects to our Blessed Lord, than hitherto we have been, I am in hopes That the Church of *England* will lay a dead Hold upon that great Depositum which the Laws have put into her hands, which is the only Instrument of our Reformation, I mean the *English Bible*. We are very bad now; But what would become of us, if we should likewise be deprived of the only means to make us better? If all the Laws of the Land were Abolished there could be no Loyalty: And if the Gospel were taken away, which is the Laws and Statutes of Heaven, how were it possible for us to be the Subjects of Jesus Christ? We might indeed be the Servants of Men, and Vassals to the Pope, but we could not possibly obey the Gospel of Christ, if it were taken and hid from us. We remember full well who they were that would not suffer an *English Bible* to be in this Kingdom for very many Ages together: And if any devout and Religious Soul, who desired to know his Masters will, had gotten but the Lords Prayer, or Ten Commandments in *English*, it cost him his Life. We shall never forget the Seven *Coventry* Martyrs, who were Burned all together in the little Park, the 4th. of *April 1519.* for teaching their Children and Family the Lords Prayer, and Ten Commandments in *English*. Nor shall we ever forget how the poor Children were sent for, and charged in no wise to meddle any more with those very small Scriptures, upon pain of suffering the same Death with their Parents. What is once made Heresie by an Infallible Church, must be always

always, and every where Heresie, though Heresie indeed is not every where Burning, for want of opportunity. Thanks be to God and our good Laws that it is not so here. And I hope the Church of *England* will always be careful to assert the Authority and Majesty of the Laws, which are so much to be preferred and valued above our Lives, in as much as by them we enjoy both our Lives and the Protestant Religion together. May God be entreated to continue this Unvaluable and Undeserved Blessing to us and to our Posterity. *Amen.*

Some

Some Reflections upon the Additional Libel, intituled, *An Instance of the Church of England's Loyalty.*

IT is a just Judgment upon those who have Renounced their Reason to embrace Transubstantiation, and thereby have distorted their natural faculties, That their Understandings stand awry for ever after, and we cannot expect so much as Common sense from them any more. From thenceforward they Write as well as Believe contradictory Mysteries; and he that means to comprehend their awkerd and perverse reasonings must stand upon his Head. We need not go far to fetch Examples of this, for the late *Instance of the Church of England's Loyalty*, is a remarkable Instance of all that I have said: Wherein there are these following Absurdities, delivered in a way of much smartness, and with the appearance of very close Reasoning.

1. The Articles and Canons of the Church of *England* are set aside, and some few Addresses in this present Reign, are made the Standard of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*.

2. The Bishops and Clergy of several Convocations, who have been Dead these Hundred years, are rendred Disloyal, for not governing themselves by these Addresses two years ago, which they knew not of.

3. *Mary Queen of Scots* is made *Queen of England* by such an Argument as makes her No *Queen of Scots*, and by giving her anothers Kingdom takes away her own.

4. *Mary Queen of Scots* is made *Queen of England* upon the Hypothesis of the Paternal Right, when upon that Hypothesis she was disinherited and foreclosed from the Crown of *England* by two Successive Patriarchs, *Henry the 8.* and *Edward the 6.* I should think for that very Reason, That the Hypothesis of the Laws had been a much Better Hypothesis.

In the opening a little and shewing these Absurdities I suppose I shall meet with all that is remarkable in that Paper.

1. The Articles and Canons of the Church of *England* are set aside, and some few Addresses in this present Reign, are made the Standard of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*. p. 3. and 5. Is this *Arguing from the Church of England's Own Principles*? which he lays is the *Design of his Paper*, p. 6. Is it the Principle of any One Clergyman in *England*, That the Doctrine of the Church of *England* is to be fought for and found out in Addresses? Or in any thing but the Liturgy and Homilies, the Articles and Canons of the Church, which have the Publick Sanction and the Universal consent of the whole Clergy? If he had found materials out of any of these to make good his charge of Disloyalty, he had done like a Man, and the Church of *England* had been Condemned out of her own

Mouth ; But if he cannot do this at present, we will have patience to stay till he can, and in the mean time he had done wiselier to have said nothing.

2. The Bishops and Clergy of several Convocations, who have been Dead these Hundred years, are rendred Disloyal, for not governing themselves by these Addresses two years ago, which they knew not of. This is a great Hardship indeed, that men shall be tryed and condemned by Laws, which were not promulged till an Hundred years after their Death. The present Church of *England* has a very great Reverence for those Bishops and Clergy, who were the Restorers of the Protestant Religion to this Kingdom, and who had formerly hazarded their Lives for it, and will be very loth to see them pass under the Character of Traytors and Rebels : And when we Demand, What Laws of the Land, or what Principles of the Church of *England* they had transgressed, we are in effect told, That they were Rebels against some chosen Expressions in very modern Addresses. The Instance which he gives is the Church of *England's* behaviour towards *Mary Queen of Scots* above an Hundred years ago : Now mark his words p. 5. " But " yet because I am about to give a notorious Instance of their Receding from this Principle, (namely the Divine Right of Succession) when the Practise of it thwarted their " Interest, it will not be amiss to observe, that they have Acknowledged in their several " Addresses to his present Majesty, upon his Accession to the Crown, the Unalterable " and Inherent Right of Succession. Now this is the Reasoning which, as I said before, would make a Man stand upon his Head. Besides, How could they Recede or go back from a Principle which they never came to, and were never nearer it than than at an Hundred years Distance ? For their Opinion or Principle, call it what you will, was this, as appears by the 27. *Eliz.* That in case an Heir in Remainder killed the present Lawful Possessor of the Crown, that person had not a Divine Right of Succession : And that neither God nor the Laws ever meant to Reward the fallhood of Treason, and the bloody Usurpation of a Crown, with so much the Earlier possession of it. My business is not to concern my self about either of these Principles or opinions, but only to shew the absurd reasoning of this Writer.

3. *Mary Queen of Scots* is made Queen of *England* by such an Argument as makes her no Queen of *Scots*, and by giving her another's Kingdom takes away her own. The Argument is this, That Queen *Elizabeth* being Illegitimate, and only an Act-of-Parliament-Queen, could not interpose betwixt the Crown of *England* and *Mary Queen of Scots*, who was Heir by Inherent Birth-right. Now does not all the World know, That all the Title that *Mary Queen of Scots* had to the Kingdom of *Scotland*, was an Act of Parliament made at *Scots* in the time of *Robert the First* ; whereby his Issue by *Elizabeth Moore* his Concubine, (whom he never Married, but who was afterwards Married to one *Giffard* a Gentleman of *Louthien*) were made Inheritable to the Crown ; and at the same time all his Legitimate Children, by his Lawful Queen *Eupheme*, were set aside. These men take just the same Measures as their Father *Garnet* did in the Gun-Powder Treason, who Resolved, That in order to blow up the Hereticks, they might Lawfully blow up their Catholick Friends too : Nay, all that this Instancer says against Queen *Elizabeth* (admitting it to be True, which we do not) bears much harder upon the Title of *Mary Queen of Scots*. Was Queen *Anns* Marriage with *Hen. 8.* naught ? But in *Elizabeth Moores* Case there was no Marriage at all. Or was King *Edward* set aside to make

make way for Illegitimate *Elizabeth*? But so it was done by the Act at *Scots*. Every body understands the English of Queen *Ann Bolens* Precontract, when they Remember, That King *Henry* the 8th. was Married again to the Lady *Jane Seymour*, within Three days after the Beheading of that Queen.

4. *Mary Queen of Scots* is made Queen of *England* upon the Hypothesis of the Paternal Right, p. 3. and 5. when upon that Hypothesis she was disinherited and foreclosed from the Crown of *England* by two Successive Patriarchs, *Henry* the 8th. and *Edward* the 6th. *Henry* the 8th. by his last Will and Testament excluded the House of *Scotland*, and *Edward* the 6th. by his Will excluded both that and his own Sisters likewise. But as the Bishop of *Ros* argued against the first Will, that it was not subscribed by his Graces own hand-writing, as was directed by the Act of Parliament, but only signed with a stamp of his Name; so King *Edward* was never enabled by an Act of Parliament to dispose of the Crown at all: And so neither of these Wills signified any thing, because the Prince has no Power but what the Law gives him. Whereas if these fore-said Princes had been Patriarchs, and full of Inherent Paternal Power, they could have Disinherited without an Act of Parliament. For if a Father cannot Disinherit, much less has he Power of Life and Death.

It were endless to reckon up all the awkerd and wilful mistakes which fill up that Sheet of Paper. As where he insinuates p. 7. that the 13th. of *Elizabeth* was owing to the Queens Conscienceless of the Insufficiency of her Title: It is nothing so; But it was made for the Preservation of her Person, and that no body presuming upon an Unalterable and Unforfeitable Title in Reversion might immediately Destroy her. An Act it is which is Law to this day, and was recited 13 *Carols* 2. and there Expressly made a Pattern for the 13th. of his Reign. And whereas he says p. 8. "That before the Queen of *Scots* was taken off, and so the Succession pretty well secured against Popery, the Church of *England* never Persecuted any of her Protestant Dissenters, but as soon as that Work was done, and the Court likely to continue on their side, then out flies the 35 *Eliz.* cap. 2. against Sectaries: In those very few words there are a great many Blots. For 1st. I hope the 23 of *Elizabeth* was several years before the Death of the Queen of *Scots*, and if that Act was not made against the Protestant Dissenters, they have had the more wrong done them, in having been since Prosecuted upon that Act. 2d. He words it as if the 35 of *Elizabeth* came out the next day, or at least very shortly after the Death of the Queen of *Scots*; whereas it was not till many years after. 3d. Whereas the present Church of *England* is upbraided with the 35 of *Eliz.* it is not beyond the memory of Man since in this Church a Bill passed both Houses of Parliament for the Repeal of that Act; but when it came to the Royal Assent, the Bill was not to be found, and they say there was foul play in the losing of that Bill. But I think the greatest blot and blunder of all is a little above in the same page, in these words: *After the Queen of Scots Condemnation the Parliament Petition'd for her Execution, each House apart; and the Bishops gave their Reasons why it ought to be.* If the Bishops had Reasons why it ought to be, then they were no Traytors nor Rebels as they are all along branded; then they did not kill the Heir that the Inheritance might be theirs, for that we are very sure ought not to be. And if their Reasons are weak and Insufficient, and in effect no Reasons, why then are they not Answered? For the bare mentioning of them without answering them, will leave a suspicion

suspicion in all mens minds, that there is somewhat in them which is Unanswerable. And truly this is just such another piece of work, as a very young and unskilful Conjurer uses to perform, in raising what he cannot lay.

In a word, I do not see one true and close thing in this Paper, unless it be this, p. 3. *That the Church of England-men themselves do not Obey their own Canons.* Which if they had Obeyed, and particularly the 114. Canon, whereby they are Bound to Present all Popish Recusants and all that are Popishly given, every year; They had not this day been troubled with New Tests and Instances of their Loyalty: But failing in that part of their Loyalty and Obedience, they are now Questioned for all the rest. However it is never too late for men to return to their Duty.

To conclude, I would advise these Popish Scriblers to let the Church of England alone, which has both the Truth of God and the Laws of the Land on her side; and having Heaven and Earth on her side, all the Powers of Hell cannot prevail against her; much less is she to be run down by a few Impotent Libels, which can never attain their end, nor arrive at their Conclusion, though we should grant them all their own Premises. For supposing Queen *Ann's* Confession of a Precontract, yet that does not make Queen *Elizabeth* Illegitimate: And supposing her Illegitimate, and only an Act of Parliament-Queen, yet that does not make her an Unlawful Queen: And supposing her an Unlawful Queen, and without a Legal Title, and only Queen for the time being, yet the Church of England were not Rebels and Traytors for Assisting her, but did their true Duty of Allegiance, as is expressly said in the 11 Hen. 7. c. 1. which Act was made on purpose to save the Peoples Allegiance in that Case, who had like to have been Ruined but a little before, by the cross Pretensions and Alternately prevailing Titles of *York* and *Lancaster*. Nay to go farther, supposing that Queen *Elizabeth* was an Usurper, and the Church of England over and above Traytors and Rebels, and thereupon all the Laws made in her time of no Authority; (for that I know is the point that they would beat, and the only meaning of all this Scurrility poured forth upon that Queen and her Clergy) yet still they would lose their Aim; those Laws having been confirmed in so many Parliaments since, and by such Princes, as now they list not to bark at: Though heretofore the Jesuite *Parsons* in his Book of the Succession, under the Name of *Doleman*, shewed himself and his Fraternity to be as much Devoted to *K. James's* Title, as this Author is now to Queen *Elizabeth*. In short, being nothing is to be gotten by Railing against Queen *Elizabeth*, and by making her Illegitimate; they may as well let her rest in Peace, or pass for Legitimate: And they may save the foul spittle they are daily casting upon her, which will serve much better for the making of their Holy Water.

F I N I S.